2010 State of Montana Noxious Weed List	
Priority 1A	These weeds are not present in Montana. Management criteria will require eradication if detected; education; and prevention. - Yellow starthistle (*Centaurea solstitialis*)
Priority 1B	These weeds have limited presence in Montana. Management criteria will require eradication or containment and education. - Dyer's woad (*Isatis tinctoria*) - Flowering rush (*Butomus umbellatus*) - Japanese knotweed complex (*Polygonum spp.*) - Purple loosestrife (*Lythrum spp*.) - Rush skeletonweed (*Chondrilla juncea*) - Eurasian watermilfoil (*Myriophyllum spicatum*) - Scotch broom (*Cytisus scoparius*) - Curlyleaf pondweed (*Potamogeton crispus*)
Priority 2A	These weeds are common in isolated areas of Montana. Management criteria will require eradication or containment where less abundant. **Management shall be prioritized by local weed districts**. - Tansy ragwort (*Senecio jacobaea*) - Meadow hawkweed complex (*Hieracium spp*.) - Orange hawkweed (*Hieracium aurantiacum*) - Tall buttercup (*Ranunculus acris*) - Perennial pepperweed (*Lepidium latifolium*) - Yellowflag iris (*Iris pseudacorus*) - Blueweed (*Echium vulgare*) - Hoary alyssum (*Berteroa incana*)
Priority 2B	These weeds are abundant in Montana and widespread in many counties. Management criteria will require eradication or containment where less abundant. **Management shall be prioritized by local weed districts.** - Canada thistle (*Cirsium arvense*) - Field bindweed (*Convolvulus arvensis*) - Leafy spurge (*Euphorbia esula*) - Whitetop (*Cardaria draba*) - Russian kapweed (*Centaurea repens*) - Spotted knapweed (*Centaurea stoebe* or *maculosa*) - Diffuse knapweed (*Centaurea diffusa*) - Dalmatian toadflax (*Linaria dalmatica*) - St. Johnswort (*Hypericum perforatum*) - Sulfur cinquefoil (*Potentilla recta*) - Common tansy (*Tanacetum vulgare*) - Oxeye daisy (*Chrysanthemum leucanthemum or Leucanthemum vulgare*) - Houndstongue (*Cynoglossum officinale*) - Yellow toadflax (*Linaria vulgaris*) - Saltcedar (*Tamarix spp*.)
Priority 3	Regulated Plants: (NOT MONTANA LISTED NOXIOUS WEEDS) These regulated plants have the potential to have significant negative impacts. The plant may not be intentionally spread or sold other than as a contaminant in agricultural products. The state recommends research, education and prevention to minimize the spread of the regulated plant. - Cheatgrass (Bromus tectorum) - Hydrilla (Hydrilla verticillata)

Allotment Forest Plan Compliance Summary for 2003-2012											
	Allotment	**2012**	**2011**	**2010**	**2009***	**2008**	**2007**	**2006**	**2005**	**2004**	**2003**
1	Seymour**	Yes	Yes	Unknown. Lack of range staff to conduct end of season monitoring.	Unknown. Early snow cover prevented inspection of the ground.	Unknown. Early snow cover prevented inspection of the ground.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	Fishtrap	Unknown. Lack of time to inspect allotment prior to snow cover.	Unknown. Lack of range staff to conduct end of season monitoring.	Yes	Yes	Unknown. Early snow cover prevented inspection of the ground.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3	Mudd Creek	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No. Did not meet FP range standard #7. Riparian forage utilization exceeded on WCT stream.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
4	Pintlar Creek	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No. Did not meet FP range standard #6. Upland forage utilization exceeded.	Yes	Yes
5	Mussigbrod**	No. Did not meet FP standards #1 and #3. Stream bank disturbance standard exceeded, and special grazing area was not protected.	No. Did not meet FP standards #1 and #3. Stream bank disturbance standard exceeded, and special grazing area was not protected.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Allotment Forest Plan Compliance Summary for 2003-2012											
	Allotment	**2012**	**2011**	**2010**	**2009***	**2008**	**2007**	**2006**	**2005**	**2004**	**2003**
6	Ruby Creek	No. Did not meet FP standard #1. Stream bank disturbance was exceeded.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
7	Dry Creek**	Yes	Yes	Yes	No. Did not meet FP range standards #2, #6, and #7. AOI was not followed, and upland and riparian forage utilization standards were exceeded.	Yes	Yes	No. Did not meet FP range standards #2, and #6. AOI was not followed and upland forage utilization standard was exceeded.	Yes	Yes	Yes
8	Twin Lakes	Little Lake - Yes Big Lake – Yes	Little Lake-Yes Big Lake-No. AOI and FP #1. AOI was not followed, and stream bank disturbance standard was exceeded.	Little Lake-Yes Big Lake-Yes	Little Lake-Yes (rested) Big Lake-Yes-	Little Lake-Yes Big Lake-Yes	Little Lake-No. Did not meet FP range standard #7. Riparian forage utilization standard was exceeded. Big Lake-Yes	Little Lake-Yes Big Lake-Yes	Little Lake-Yes (rested) Big Lake-Yes	Little Lake-No. Did not meet FP range standard #7. Riparian forage utilization standard was exceeded. Big Lake-No. Did not meet FP range standard #2. AOI was not followed.	Little Lake-Yes Big Lake-Yes
9	Monument	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
10	Pioneer	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No. Did not meet FP range standard#7. Riparian forage utilization standard was	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Allotment Forest Plan Compliance Summary for 2003-2012											
	Allotment	**2012**	**2011**	**2010**	**2009***	**2008**	**2007**	**2006**	**2005**	**2004**	**2003**
							exceeded.				
11	Saginaw	No. Did not meet FP standards #1 and #3. Upland forage utilization was exceeded, and stream bank disturbance standard was exceeded on WCT streams. Special grazing areas were not protected.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No. Did not meet FP range standards #6 and #7. Upland and riparian forage utilization standards were exceeded.	No. Did not meet FP range standards #6 and #7. Upland and riparian forage utilization standards were exceeded.

* Prior to and including 2009, allotments were administered under interim grazing standards identified in the 1997 Forest Plan Riparian Amendment to the 1986 Forest Plan.
** Allotments are co-managed with the BLM, and with the FS as the lead agency. Seymour allotment is also co-managed with the MTFWP.

WCT – Westslope cutthroat trout
AOI – Annual Operating Instructions

Rangeland Health Indicator Assessment
Summary By Allotment

Allotment	Rangeland Health Indicators			
	Species Composition	**Shrub Cover**	**Ground Cover**	**Noxious Weeds**
Seymour	*Uplands*: Upland sites are considered to be meeting desired conditions, but the current composition consists of a higher than expected amount of less desirable native grasses. Overall, there has been an increase in desirable grasses, which would suggest an improving trend for these sites. *Riparian*: The sampled riparian site is considered to be meeting desired conditions for the composition of important shrubs and grasses. Composition trend not known.	*Uplands*: No shrub cover was recorded on grassland sites, and sagebrush-grassland habitat types were not sampled. *Riparian*: Total shrub cover for dominant willows is considered low, but is within the range of variability for the habitat type. Shrub cover trend is not known.	*Uplands*: Overall, upland sites are meeting desired ground cover conditions, and there is an apparent trend towards increased ground cover on these sites. *Riparian*: For the sampled riparian site, ground cover is considered to be slightly below desired amounts. Ground cover trend is not known.	*Uplands*: Noxious weeds were not detected, but are present within allotment. Uplands are currently functioning in a manner that resists invasion by weeds. *Riparian*: Noxious weeds were not detected, but are present within allotment. The sampled riparian site may be at increased risk to invasion due to reduced ground cover, but is functioning in a manner the resists invasion by weeds.

Allotment	Rangeland Health Indicators			
	Species Composition	**Shrub Cover**	**Ground Cover**	**Noxious Weeds**
Fishtrap	*Uplands*: Sampled upland sites are meeting desired conditions for the composition of important shrubs and grasses. There appears to be an improving trend towards more desirable grass species. *Riparian*: Species composition is not known, but there is an apparent trend towards desirable shrubs and grasses based on photo point monitoring on one transect site.	*Uplands*: Sagebrush cover is low, but is within the range of variability for the habitat type. The apparent trend is towards increased shrub cover on sagebrush-grassland sites. *Riparian*: Shrub cover is not known, but photo point monitoring on one transect indicates a trend towards increased shrub cover.	*Uplands*: Sampled upland sites are meeting desired ground cover conditions. The apparent trend is towards increased cover. *Riparian*: Ground cover is not known, but there is an apparent trend towards increased ground cover based on photo point monitoring on one transect site.	*Uplands*: Noxious weeds were not detected, but are present within the allotment. Uplands are currently functioning in a manner that resists invasion by weeds. *Riparian*: Noxious weeds were not detected, but are present within the allotment. The riparian photo point monitoring site is thought to be functioning in a manner that resists invasion by weeds.
Mudd Creek	*Uplands*: Overall, uplands are meeting desired conditions for species composition, but a decrease in important forage species was recorded on two transects. The condition trend is considered to be static. *Riparian*: Species composition is not known, but may be a trend towards more desirable shrubs and grasses based on photo point monitoring on one transect site.	*Uplands*: Sagebrush cover is meeting desired conditions, and the trend is towards increased shrub cover on sagebrush-grassland sites. *Riparian*: Shrub cover not known, but photo point monitoring on one transect site showed an appreciable increase in willow cover. This suggests a trend towards increased shrub cover.	*Uplands*: Ground cover is not meeting desired conditions. The trend is considered to be mostly static. *Riparian*: Ground cover is not known, but there is an apparent trend towards increased ground cover based on photo point monitoring on one transect site.	*Uplands*: Noxious weeds were not detected, but are present within the allotment. Uplands are thought to be at increased risk to invasion due high amounts of bare ground. *Riparian*: Noxious weeds were not detected, but are present within the allotment. The photo point monitoring site is thought to be functioning in a manner that resists invasion by weeds.

Allotment	Rangeland Health Indicators			
	Species Composition	**Shrub Cover**	**Ground Cover**	**Noxious Weeds**
Pintlar Creek	*Uplands*: Overall, sampled upland sites are not meeting desired conditions for species composition. Overall, the composition of important forage plants has been reduced, which would suggest that conditions are trending away from desired objectives. *Riparian*: The sampled riparian site is not meeting desired conditions for species composition, and the trend in plant composition is not known.	*Uplands*: Sagebrush cover is meeting desired conditions on sagebrush-grassland sites. The trend in shrub cover is variable, but appears to be static overall. *Riparian*: Total shrub cover for dominant willows on the sampled site is considered to be appreciably below desired amounts. The trend in shrub cover is not known.	*Uplands*: Overall, uplands are considered to be meeting desired conditions for ground cover, and are trending towards increased cover. *Riparian*: The sampled riparian site is not meeting desired conditions for ground cover. The amount of bare ground recorded on this site is considered excessive. The trend in ground cover is not known.	*Uplands*: Noxious weeds were not detected, but are present within the allotment. Uplands are currently functioning in a manner that resists invasion by weeds. *Riparian*: Noxious weeds were not detected, but are present within allotment. The sampled riparian site is at increased risk to invasion due to reduced ground cover, and is not functioning in a manner the resists invasion by weeds.

Allotment	Rangeland Health Indicators			
	Species Composition	**Shrub Cover**	**Ground Cover**	**Noxious Weeds**
Mussigbrod	*Uplands*: Upland sites are meeting desired composition objectives for important shrubs, but the composition of important forage species such as Idaho fescue and bluebunch wheatgrass are below desired amounts. Overall, they are considered to be trending away from desired conditions. *Riparian*: The sampled riparian site is meeting desired conditions for species composition, but trend is not known.	*Uplands*: Sagebrush cover on sagebrush-grassland sites is considered to be meeting desired conditions. The trend in shrub cover is unclear, but is likely towards increased amounts due to sites recovering from a wildfire event in 2000. *Riparian*: Total shrub cover on the sampled riparian site was considered to be very low, but is likely still recovering from the wildfire event in 2000.	*Uplands*: Overall, ground cover on upland sites are considered to be somewhat below desired objectives, but are within the range of variability expected for these rangelands. Trend in ground cover is variable, but is estimated to be mostly static. *Riparian*: The sampled riparian site is considered to be meeting desired conditions for ground cover. Trend is not known.	*Uplands*: Noxious weeds were not detected, but are present within the allotment. Overall, uplands are currently functioning in a manner that resists invasion by weeds, but where ground cover is below average, these sites have an increased risk to invasion by weeds. *Riparian*: Canada thistle was detected on sampled riparian site, but the site has high native plant cover which would suggest high resistance to weed expansion, and to invasion by weeds.

Allotment	Rangeland Health Indicators			
	Species Composition	**Shrub Cover**	**Ground Cover**	**Noxious Weeds**
Ruby Creek	*Uplands*: Upland sites sampled are not meeting desired conditions for species composition. The composition of some important native forage species has been appreciably reduced, and nonnative grasses such as Kentucky bluegrass have increased substantially. The apparent trend appears to be away from desired conditions. *Riparian*: Sampled riparian sites are considered to be meeting desired conditions for species composition. The trend in composition is not known.	*Uplands*: No shrub cover was recorded on grassland sites, and sagebrush-grassland habitat types were not sampled. *Riparian*: Total shrub cover for dominant willows on sampled riparian sites is considered to be below desired conditions. The trend in shrub cover is not known.	*Uplands*: Overall, ground cover on sampled upland sites is considered to be below desired conditions. The trend in ground cover appears to be static. *Riparian*: On sampled riparian sites, average ground cover was determined to be meeting desired objectives, but two of the four sampled sites had high amounts of bare ground. Trend is not known.	*Uplands*: Noxious weeds were not detected, but are present within the allotment. The higher than desired amounts of bare ground recorded on uplands may cause these sites to be at greater risk to invasion by weeds. *Riparian*: Canada thistle was detected on one sampled riparian site, but, overall, these sites are considered to be functioning in a manner that resists invasion by weeds, and resists expansion of existing weed populations.

Allotment	Rangeland Health Indicators			
	Species Composition	**Shrub Cover**	**Ground Cover**	**Noxious Weeds**
Dry Creek	*Uplands*: Overall, the composition of important shrubs and grasses on sampled upland sites are thought to be meeting desired conditions. The apparent trend is towards an increased composition of desirable grasses. *Riparian*: On the sampled riparian site, the composition of desirable shrubs and grasses was considered to be not meeting desired objectives. The trend in composition is not known.	*Uplands*: On sagebrush-grassland sites, sagebrush cover is considered to be meeting desired conditions. The trend in sagebrush cover is not clear, but data collected on these sites suggest that cover may be decreasing. *Riparian*: Total shrub cover for dominant willows on the sampled riparian site is considered to be well below desired amounts. The trend in shrub cover is not known.	*Uplands*: Overall, ground cover is not meeting desired conditions on sampled upland sites, and is also considered to be outside the range of variability for the habitat type. However, two of three transects showed an improving trend in ground cover. *Riparian*: The amount of ground cover recorded on the sampled riparian site is considerably lower than expected amounts, and is not meeting desired conditions. The ground cover trend for this site is not known.	*Uplands*: Noxious weeds were not detected, but are present within the allotment. The higher than desired amounts of bare ground recorded on uplands may cause these sites to be at greater risk to invasion by weeds. *Riparian*: Noxious weeds were not detected, but are present within the allotment. The sampled riparian site is at increased risk to invasion due to reduced ground cover, and is not functioning in a manner the resists invasion by weeds.

Allotment	Rangeland Health Indicators			
	Species Composition	**Shrub Cover**	**Ground Cover**	**Noxious Weeds**
Twin Lakes	*Uplands*: On upland sites, the composition of important shrubs is meeting desired conditions. On two of three transects, the composition of important forage species such as Idaho fescue is desirable, but this species was completely absent on the third transect. A high composition of less desirable grasses was found on all three sites, which may suggest an undesirable trend towards these species. *Riparian*: Riparian sites sampled are either forested riparian habitats, or are trending towards a forested plant community.	*Uplands*: Sagebrush cover on upland sites is meeting desired conditions, and is within the range of variability for this habitat type. The apparent trend is towards increased sagebrush cover on these sites. *Riparian*: Sampled riparian sites had low willow cover, which is expected for riparian plant communities that are trending towards a more forested habitat.	*Uplands*: Upland sites are meeting desired conditions for ground cover, and the apparent trend is towards increasing cover. *Riparian*: Riparian sites are meeting desired conditions for ground cover. Trend is not known.	*Uplands*: Noxious weeds were not detected, but are present within the allotment. Uplands are currently functioning in a manner that resists invasion by weeds. *Riparian*: Noxious weeds were not detected, but are present within the allotment. Sampled sites are considered to be functioning in a manner that resists invasion by weeds.

Allotment	Rangeland Health Indicators			
	Species Composition	**Shrub Cover**	**Ground Cover**	**Noxious Weeds**
Monument	*Uplands*: Overall, the existing composition of important shrubs and grasses is in a desirable condition, but there has been an overall reduction in desirable grasses such as Idaho fescue. For this reason, the trend is considered to be moving away from desired objectives for these sites. *Riparian*: Riparian sites are considered to meeting desired conditions for important shrubs and grasses. A high composition of these plants was recorded. The composition trend for these sites is not known.	*Uplands*: Sagebrush cover is meeting desired conditions, and is within the range of variability for this sagebrush-grassland habitat type. The apparent trend is towards increased sagebrush cover. *Riparian*: Total shrub cover for dominant willows on sampled riparian sites is considered to be below desired objectives. The trend for shrub cover on these sites is not known.	*Uplands*: Upland sites are not meeting desired conditions for ground cover; however, the apparent trend is that these sites are moving towards desired objectives. *Riparian*: Overall, ground cover on sampled riparian sites is considered to be somewhat below desired levels. The trend for ground cover is not known.	*Uplands*: Noxious weeds were not detected, but are present within the allotment. The higher than desired amounts of bare ground recorded on uplands may cause these sites to be at greater risk to invasion by weeds. *Riparian*: Noxious weeds were not detected, but are present within allotment. The sampled riparian sites may be at increased risk to invasion by weeds due to reduced ground cover.

Allotment	Rangeland Health Indicators			
	Species Composition	**Shrub Cover**	**Ground Cover**	**Noxious Weeds**
Pioneer	*Uplands*: The composition of important shrubs and grasses is considered to be meeting desired conditions, but an overall reduction in a key forage grass (i.e., Idaho fescue) was recorded. The trend in composition is considered to be static. *Riparian*: Overall, sampled riparian sites are considered to be meeting desired conditions for species composition. Both high frequency and cover was recorded for desirable plants. The composition trend for these sites is not known.	*Uplands*: Sagebrush cover is considered to be meeting desired conditions, and is within the range of variability for this sagebrush-grassland habitat type. However, the average cover for sampled sites is high (27%), and these sites are thought to be trending towards increased cover. This could result in a lack of age class diversity on these sites. *Riparian*: Total shrub cover for dominant willows was recorded to be well below desired levels on the only willow/grass plant community sampled. However, this low amount may be expected due to inherent site characteristics. The trend for riparian shrub cover is not known.	*Uplands*: Overall, upland sites are meeting desired conditions for ground cover, but are considered to be somewhat below the average for similar habitat types in late seral or climax vegetation condition. However, these upland sites appear to be trending towards increased cover. *Riparian*: Overall, riparian sites are meeting desired conditions for ground cover amounts. The trend in ground cover for these sites is not known.	*Uplands*: Noxious weeds were not detected, but are present within the allotment. Uplands are currently functioning in a manner that resists invasion by weeds. *Riparian*: Noxious weeds were not detected, but are present within the allotment. Sampled riparian sites are considered to be functioning in a manner that resists invasion by weeds.

Allotment	Rangeland Health Indicators			
	Species Composition	**Shrub Cover**	**Ground Cover**	**Noxious Weeds**
Saginaw	*Uplands*: The composition of important shrub and grass species was found to be present in satisfactory amounts to meet rangeland health objectives, but, overall, the composition of a key forage plant (Idaho fescue) was recorded to be appreciably below average amounts shown in research data for similar habitat types. The apparent composition trend for most transect sites is considered to be static. *Riparian*: Overall, sampled riparian sites are meeting desired composition conditions for key shrub and grass species. The composition trend for these sites is not known.	*Uplands*: On sampled sagebrush-grassland sites, sagebrush cover is considered to be meeting desired conditions, and is considered to be within the range of variability for this habitat type. Although recorded data shows a major decrease in shrub cover, these sites are still recovering from prescribed burn events conducted in 2004. For this reason, there is a likely trend towards increased sagebrush cover. *Riparian*: For sampled willow/grass sites, the total shrub cover recorded for dominant willows is considered to be below desired amounts. Encroachment by conifers could provide a partial explanation for this existing condition. The trend for shrub cover on these willow sites is not known.	*Uplands*: All upland sites sampled are meeting desired conditions for ground cover, and the apparent trend in cover appears to be static. *Riparian*: Overall, sampled riparian sites are considered to be not meeting desired conditions for ground cover. The trend in ground cover is not known.	*Uplands*: Noxious weeds were not detected, but are present within the allotment. Uplands are currently functioning in a manner that resists invasion by weeds. *Riparian*: Canada thistle was detected on one sampled riparian site, and other weed species are known to occur within the allotment. Overall, riparian sites are considered to be at increased risk to weed invasion due to higher than desired amounts of bare ground.

Summary of Statutory and Regulatory Consistency

Range and Weeds Summary of Statutory and Regulatory Consistency				
Regulatory Requirement	**No Grazing Alternative**	**Current Grazing Alternative**	**Proposed Action**	**Alternative 4**
National Environmental Policy Act (1969)	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because there would be beneficial effects to the vegetation resource.	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because interim Forest Plan grazing standards would be implemented to reduce or prevent adverse effects to the vegetation resource.	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because proposed allowable use levels and mitigation measures and design features would be implemented to reduce or prevent adverse effects to the vegetation resource.	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because proposed allowable use levels and mitigation measures and design features would be implemented to reduce or prevent adverse effects to the vegetation resource.
National Forest Management Act (1976)	No. Alternative is not consistent with Act because it does not provide forage for livestock grazing, and does not contribute to the social and economic well-being of local communities (Forest Plan, pp. 21 and 25)	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because it provides forage for livestock grazing, and contributes to the social and economic well-being of local communities.	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because it provides forage for livestock grazing, and contributes to the social and economic well-being of local communities.	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because it provides forage for livestock grazing, and contributes to the social and economic well-being of local communities.

Range and Weeds Summary of Statutory and Regulatory Consistency				
Regulatory Requirement	**No Grazing Alternative**	**Current Grazing Alternative**	**Proposed Action**	**Alternative 4**
The Granger-Thayer Act (1950)	No. Alternative is not consistent with Act because it would terminate existing term grazing permits, and no receipts would be collected for range improvement work.	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because it would allow for reissuance of existing term grazing permits, and receipts would be collected for range improvement work.	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because it would allow for reissuance of existing term grazing permits, and receipts would be collected for range improvement work.	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because it would allow for reissuance of existing term grazing permits, and receipts would be collected for range improvement work.
The Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act (1960)	Yes. Although this alternative does not provide for livestock grazing, it does not prohibit other multiple uses, or impair the productivity of the land.	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because it provides for multiple uses, including sustained yield of livestock forage, and does not impair the productivity of the land.	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because it provides for multiple uses, including sustained yield of livestock forage, and does not impair the productivity of the land.	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because it provides for multiple uses, including sustained yield of livestock forage, and does not impair the productivity of the land.
The Forest and Rangeland Renewable Planning Act (1974)	Not applicable because livestock grazing would be removed from the project area, and there would be no need for a suitability analysis.	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because it identified the suitability of lands for grazing based on the Forest Plan capability analysis.	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because it identified the suitability of lands for grazing based on the Forest Plan capability analysis, and site-specific suitability analysis.	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because it identified the suitability of lands for grazing based on the Forest Plan capability analysis, and site-specific suitability analysis.

Range and Weeds Summary of Statutory and Regulatory Consistency				
Regulatory Requirement	**No Grazing Alternative**	**Current Grazing Alternative**	**Proposed Action**	**Alternative 4**
The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (1976)	Yes. Although this alternative does not provide forage for livestock grazing, it provides food and habitat for fish and wildlife resources.	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because it provides for sustainable livestock forage, and food and habitat for fish and wildlife.	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because it provides for sustainable livestock forage, and food and habitat for fish and wildlife.	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because it provides for sustainable livestock forage, and food and habitat for fish and wildlife.
The Public Rangelands Improvement Act (1978)	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because it would result in improvement to the rangeland resource.	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because it would result in improvement to the rangeland resource with implementation of, and compliance with interim Forest Plan grazing standards.	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because it would result in improvement to the rangeland resource with implementation of proposed allowable use levels, and mitigation measures and design features.	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Act because it would result in improvement to the rangeland resource with implementation of proposed allowable use levels, and mitigation measures and design features.
Forest Service Manual 2200 and Forest Service Handbook 2209.13	Yes. Alternative would be consistent with policy because it does not conflict with direction provided in the manual or handbook.	Yes. Alternative is consistent because livestock grazing would be administered in accordance with direction provided in the manual and handbook.	Yes. Alternative is consistent because livestock grazing would be administered in accordance with direction provided in the manual and handbook.	Yes. Alternative is consistent because livestock grazing would be administered in accordance with direction provided in the manual and handbook.

Range and Weeds Summary of Statutory and Regulatory Consistency				
Regulatory Requirement	**No Grazing Alternative**	**Current Grazing Alternative**	**Proposed Action**	**Alternative 4**
Beaverhead-Deerlodge Land and Resource Management Plan, or Forest Plan (2009)	No. Alternative is not consistent with Forest Plan because it does not provide forage for livestock grazing, and does not contribute to the social and economic well-being of local communities (Forest Plan, pp. 21 and 25)	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Forest Plan because it provides forage for livestock grazing, and contributes to the social and economic well-being of local communities (Forest Plan, pp. 21 and 25)	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Forest Plan because it provides forage for livestock grazing, and contributes to the social and economic well-being of local communities (Forest Plan, pp. 21 and 25)	Yes. Alternative is consistent with Forest Plan because it provides forage for livestock grazing, and contributes to the social and economic well-being of local communities (Forest Plan, pp. 21 and 25)